

1 HARMEET K. DHILLON (SBN: 207873)
2 harmeet@dhillonlaw.com
3 NITOJ P. SINGH (SBN: 265005)
4 nsingh@dhillonlaw.com
5 DHILLON LAW GROUP INC.
6 177 Post Street, Suite 700
7 San Francisco, California 94108
8 Telephone: (415) 433-1700
9 Facsimile: (415) 520-6593

10 Attorneys for Second Measure, Inc., Michael Babineau,
11 and Lillian Chou

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13 SECOND MEASURE, INC., a Delaware
14 corporation,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 STEVEN KIM, an individual,

18 Defendant,

19
20
21 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case Number: 3:15-CV-03395-JCS

**PLAINTIFF SECOND MEASURE
INC.'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 2 TO
EXCLUDE CERTAIN EVIDENCE
FROM DEFENDANT STEVEN KIM**

Pretrial Conference: May 19, 2017
Trial Date: June 1, 2017

Judge: Hon. Joseph C. Spero
Courtroom: G, 15th Floor

[Filed Concurrently with Declaration of Nitoj
P. Singh and [Proposed] Order]

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Second Measure Inc. (“Second Measure”) hereby seeks an order precluding Defendant Steven Kim (“Mr. Kim”) from referring at trial to, or in any way using, any evidence offering a valuation of any partnership (the “Alleged Partnership”) formed between any of Mr. Kim, Counterclaim Defendant Michael Babineau (“Mr. Babineau”), and Counterclaim Defendant Lillian Chou (“Ms. Chou”); a valuation of Second Measure; or any methodologies that may be used to determine the value of the Alleged Partnership or Second Measure.

Second Measure sought such information from Mr. Kim by way of special interrogatories on May 6, 2016. Rather than providing a substantive response, Mr. Kim punted in his June 12, 2016 responses to the interrogatories, and argued that no valuation had been conducted, and that any valuation would be provided by an expert retained by Mr. Kim. The cutoff for non-expert discovery came the next day, on June 13, 2016, without Mr. Kim providing a valuation for the Alleged Partnership or Second Measure. Nor did Mr. Kim provide an expert valuation by the expert disclosure deadline of July 1, 2016.

Mr. Kim first provided a valuation for the Alleged Partnership and Second Measure in the July 28, 2016 Rebuttal Report from Mr. Kim's expert Mark Newton ("Mr. Newton"). Mr. Newton's Rebuttal Report provided that Mr. Kim stated that the Alleged Partnership or Second Measure were valued at \$10,000,000.

Because Second Measure anticipates that Mr. Kim will try to use this information at trial to set a valuation for the Alleged Partnership or Second Measure, Second Measure now seeks order excluding such testimony as not properly disclosed by the discovery cutoff.

II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Pursuant to the Court's April 7, 2016 Order (Dkt. No. 42), the cut off for non-expert discovery was set for June 13, 2016. Mr. Kim served his responses to Second Measure's May 6, 2016 Interrogatories on June 12, 2016. (Declaration of Nitoj P. Singh in Support of Motion *in Limine* 2 ("Singh Decl."), ¶ 2, Ex. 1.) Mr. Kim did not provide any supplemental responses to the Special Interrogatories on or around June 13, 2016. (Singh Decl., ¶ 3.) Mr. Kim did provide amended

1 interrogatory responses on June 20, 2016, but those amendments did not alter the interrogatory
 2 responses at issue here. (Singh Decl., Ex. 2, pp. 6-7.) No further supplemental or amended discovery
 3 responses were received thereafter. (Singh Decl., ¶ 5.)

4 Second Measure's interrogatories required Mr. Kim to identify the value of any business he
 5 contended he formed with Mr. Babineau and/or Ms. Chou. (Singh Decl., Ex. 1, pp. 5 and 6; Ex. 2, pp.
 6 and 7.) Instead of providing a valuation, Mr. Kim responded as follows:

7 Defendant incorporates by reference the General Objections into its response to this
 8 interrogatory. Defendant objects to this interrogatory on the basis of the attorney-client
 9 privilege and work product doctrine. Defendant further notes that this interrogatory
 10 potentially requires an expert's valuation. No such valuation has occurred as of the date
 11 of these responses. To the extent a valuation is provided by an expert it will be
 12 disclosed pursuant to Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

13 (Id.)

14 **Critically, Mr. Kim did not object or argue that he was unable to provide a valuation
 15 because Second Measure's financial documents then produced in the litigation were designated
 16 as highly confidential, attorneys' eyes only, under the Protective Order in this Action.** In fact,
 17 Mr. Kim had earlier agreed to accept the financial documents as highly confidential, attorneys' eyes
 18 only, under the Protective Order, in a March 14, 2016 Meet and Confer letter, so that his expert could
 19 provide a valuation:

20 The [financial] information is also unquestionably relevant. My client contends that Mr.
 21 Babineau and he were in a business partnership, that your client improperly expropriated
 22 the entire business for himself and reincorporated it under his own name as Second
 23 Measure, Inc., and that my client was damaged as a result. The obvious measure of
 24 damages in such a case requires a valuation of Second Measure, because that is what we
 25 claim was taken from my client.

26 We propose to resolve the matter as follows: you agree to provide to us in writing on or
 27 before April 1, 2016 the following information for Second Measure: total revenue for
 28 each quarter of 2015, total costs for each quarter of 2015 (including a list of the items that
 are included as costs), and total net profit for each quarter of 2015. We would also like a
 current balance sheet. **We will take the info as AEO. We need the info for our expert.**

29 (Singh Decl., Ex. 3, p. 2, emphasis added.)

30 However, later, in Mr. Newton's July 28, 2016 Rebuttal Report, Mr. Kim apparently had
 31 undertaken an valuation of the Alleged Partnership or Second Measure, which he had not previously

1 disclosed to Second Measure.

2 According to Mr. Kim, an investment of that size typically means a valuation of
 3 approximately \$10,000,000.

4 (Singh Decl., Ex. 4, p.4.)

5 Much later, on September 24, 2016, after the close of discovery, and on the eve of the earlier
 6 trial date in this Action, Mr. Kim demanded that the financial information be re-designated as
 7 confidential only. (Singh Decl., Ex. 5.) On February 13, 2017, Second Measure agreed to redesignate
 8 the information as confidential only because it was now dated, to help facilitate a settlement of this
 9 Action, and to avoid motion practice. (Singh Decl., Ex. 6.) However, because discovery had since
 10 closed, Mr. Kim did not update his interrogatory responses, nor could Second Measure serve further
 11 discovery or depose Mr. Kim.

12 Mr. Kim now, after failing to do so in discovery, apparently wishes to use the financial
 13 information to offer a valuation of the Alleged Partnership or Second Measure at trial. If Mr. Kim
 14 wished to provide a valuation of the Alleged Partnership or Second Measure, it must have been
 15 provided by the discovery cut off, not through the back door of a statement made in Mr. Newton's
 16 Rebuttal Report, and not with the help of financial information Mr. Kim only requested after the close
 17 of discovery.

18 **III. ARGUMENT**

19 Rule 26(e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires all parties to supplement or
 20 correct, among other things, responses to discovery requests "in a timely manner if the party learns
 21 that in some material respect the disclosure or response is incomplete or incorrect, and if the
 22 additional or corrective information has not otherwise been made known to the other parties during
 23 the discovery process or in writing." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e)(1)(A). The parties are expected to
 24 supplement and/or correct their disclosures promptly when required under that Rule, without the need
 25 for a request from opposing counsel or an order from the Court. *See Oracle USA, Inc., et al. v. SAP*
 26 *AG, et al.*, 264 F.R.D. 541, 544 (N.D. Cal. 2009).

27 In addition, Rule 37 mandates that a party's failure to comply with the obligations under Rule
 28 26(e)(1) results in that party being precluded from "use [of] that information ... to supply evidence on
 a motion, at a hearing or at trial, unless the failure was substantially justified or is harmless." Fed. R.

1 Civ. P. 37(c)(1). Rule 37(c)(1) is “self-executing” and “automatic.” *Yeti by Molly Ltd v. Deckers*
 2 *Outdoor Corp.*, 259 F.3d 1101, 1106 (9th Cir. 2001). Once non-compliance is shown, the burden is
 3 on the party who failed to comply to demonstrate that it meets one of the two exceptions to
 4 mandatory sanctions. *Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co.*, No. 11-CV-01846-LHK, 2012 WL
 5 3155574, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 2, 2012).

6 Mr. Kim will likely argue that he was incapable of proffering a valuation prior to the
 7 discovery cutoff, as a result of Second Measure’s designation of certain documents as “Attorneys’
 8 Eyes Only.” This is neither here, nor there. The Parties’ stipulated protective order provides Mr. Kim
 9 with the ability to challenge confidentiality designations. Stipulated Protective Order [Dkt. 34] § 6, p.
 10 7-8. Mr. Kim could have done so while discovery was still open, and provided a response to the
 11 interrogatory at question. Mr. Kim could have also objected to the interrogatory on the grounds that
 12 he did not have the information required, and met and conferred on the issue. Mr. Kim did not pursue
 13 either of these options. Instead, he requested and accepted the financial information at issues on an
 14 attorneys’ eyes only basis, objected to the interrogatory on the grounds that his expert would provide
 15 a valuation, then, after discovery had closed, asked for the information to be redesignated as
 16 confidential so that he could analyze the same without having to provide his analysis in written
 17 discovery or at a deposition.

18 It is clear that despite being asked to provide a valuation for the Alleged Partnership or
 19 Second Measure in discovery, Mr. Kim failed to so provide a valuation. Mr. Kim further failed to
 20 provide a valuation by the non-expert discovery cut off. Accordingly, Mr. Kim should now be
 21 precluded from offering any evidence on the valuation of the Alleged Partnership or Second Measure
 22 at trial.

23

24

25 //

26 //

27 //

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, Second Measure respectfully requests that this Court issue an order
3 precluding Mr. Kim from referring to or introducing any evidence that purports to value the Alleged
4 Partnership or Second Measure.

5 Respectfully submitted,

6 Date: April 19, 2017

DHILLON LAW GROUP INC.

7 By: /s/ Nitoj P. Singh

8 Nitoj P. Singh

9 Attorneys for Second Measure Inc., Michael Babineau,
10 and Lillian Chou

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28